

individual in that individual's own right, irrespective of how he is a member of the group. All right? All I am saying is that this is small language designed to very carefully set forth when an actual conflict of interest arises that can give us a problem. It is designed to clarify the existing ambiguities in the Political Accountability and Disclosure laws. I offer that amendment.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Schmit, then Senator Pappas, then Senator Hefner, then Senator Chambers, Senator Carsten, Senator Goll, Senator Higgins. Senator Schmit, please.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, this is a most interesting amendment. Senator Johnson has outlined some of the potential impact of it. I would suggest that under this provision Senator Johnson would be prevented from voting for a budget proposal for the University of Nebraska that would have a positive impact upon Mrs. Johnson's salary. I would guess that there would be individuals in this body who work for a company or a corporation who may not then be able to vote upon a bill which would have an adverse impact upon that company. There is no doubt about it that I am perhaps a central figure in this situation and I would have to point out also that I'm probably the most visible person in the body in those things that I have done and what I do and what I do regularly and I guess I would have to ask you also then if a member is prohibited from voting on a bill, the passage of which would cause that individual immediate loss. In other words, if you have an existing legal legitimate business and this Legislature chooses, without lack of due process, to declare that business illegal, thereby resulting in the cessation of that business, is a member of this body prevented from voting on that bill? I'd like to ask you another question. Is it then legal, is it morally correct for a member of this body who might benefit from the termination of that business to vote on that bill? For example, the termination by this Legislature of the video lottery business, without lack of due process, cost me financially. There are members in this body who, by the very casting of that vote, might in the future place themselves then in another position whereby they might thereby become a competitor in that very same business and establish themselves in a more lucrative or more advantageous position. Is it possible to imagine that those votes were cast without rancor, without pick, without jealousy? I think that it's a very interesting question.